

REMARKS

Claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Yoneya et al. (US 6,300,926). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants respectfully request clarification regarding the rejection of claims 30 and 31. Specifically, claims 30 and 31 are identified in the heading of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), but claim 32 is individually identified in the body of the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants presume that, in actuality, claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Yoneya et al. Thus, if the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the exact claims being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Yoneya et al. be clearly identified in the heading of the rejection.

Independent claim 30, as originally filed, recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a LCD panel having a plurality of gate and data lines crossing each other to define a plurality of pixel regions,” “a gate driver for sequentially scanning signals to the gate lines, and supplying the low and high level common voltages to the common lines,” and “a source driver for *supplying the data voltage for negative fields to the data line of the pixel to which the high level common voltage is supplied, and for supplying the data voltage for positive fields to the data line of the pixel to which the low level common voltage is supplied,*” (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 31, as originally filed, recites an In-Plane switching mode LCD device including, in part, “a plurality of gate and data lines crossing each other to define a plurality of pixel regions,” and “a plurality of storage lines formed between the gate lines, the

storage lines to which first and second common voltages are alternately supplied," (emphasis added).

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Yoneya et al. is completely silent with regard to application of alternating common voltages, as required by independent claims 30 and 31. Specifically, as shown in FIG. 6 of Yoneya et al., the common voltage V_C does not alternate between high and low voltages. In addition, although FIG. 6 of Yoneya et al. may show two common voltages $V_{D-CENTER}$ and V_{COM} , these two common voltages do not alternate during operation of the source driver of Yoneya et al. nor are these common voltages alternately supplied to the storage lines of Yoneya et al. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Yoneya et al. is relatively silent with regard to explaining the features shown in FIG. 6, and thus, is further silent with regard to the features recited by independent claims 30 and 31.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 30 and 31, and hence dependent claims 32-35 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by the applied reference.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: August 21, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000